

**From:** [David G FARRER](#)  
**To:** [Elizabeth Allen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Lori Cora/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [danab.marcia@deq.state](#); [Rene Fuentes/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#); [Karen BISHOP](#); [Richard Kauffman/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [MCCLINCY Matt](#); [POULSEN Mike](#); [Dan Phalen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Sean Sheldrake/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Deb Yamamoto/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Todd HUDSON](#)  
**Subject:** RE: PLEASE HELP - Five minute review request - Portland HarborRisk Confusion  
**Date:** 08/03/2011 04:27 PM

---

I agree with Mike P and Jim M. In the present format, the reader has to look pretty hard to see the differences. I think the lists of differences provided by Mike P and Jim M are pretty comprehensive between the two of them.

I think that many of the differences in those two lists can be distilled down to the difference in audiences and the exclusive focus on public health.

I recommend showing a list of similarities and then the differences as Mike P outlined.

Dave Farrer

>>> "ANDERSON Jim M" <ANDERSON.Jim@deq.state.or.us> 8/3/2011 2:13 PM >>>

Dan,

I agree with Mike P, plus I think I'll take it step further by offering 2 comments.

1st, sorry to be critical, but your draft doesn't really help to explain the significant & important differences between the 2 types of risk assessments. I think the text box as is will create more confusion in the regulated community & public than by staying silent. So, I think it needs to be re-worked. I know we've said this numerous times in the PH project, but like so many other PH issues..., this isn't a new or unique issue..., doesn't EPA have canned language or guidance that we can use as a starting point?

2nd, here are the PP bullets Dave Stone used in his 4/14/11 Rep Earl Blumenauer presentation:

- Public Health Approach
  - semi-quantitative
  - health benefits considered
  - often implemented thru outreach/engagement
  - typically based on recommendations & guidelines
  - population-based risk
- Regulatory (EPA) Approach
  - quantitative & detailed process

- often prescribed in statute
- used to inform management decisions
- addresses uncertainty & variability
- human risk often inferred from animal models
- data requirements are often high

Jim Anderson  
 Manager, DEQ Portland Harbor Section  
 ph: 503.229.6825  
 fax: 503.229.6899  
 cell: 971.563.1434

-----Original Message-----

From: POULSEN Mike  
 Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2011 1:56 PM  
 To: 'Dan Phalen'; allen.elizabeth@epa.gov; Chip Humphrey; Deb Yamamoto; fuentes.rene@epa.gov; Joe Goulet; Lori Cora; Sean Sheldrake; shephard.burt@epa.gov; Kristine Koch; FARRER David.G; Richard Kauffman; ANDERSON Jim M; BISHOP Karen; danab.marcia@deq.state; MCCLINCY Matt  
 Cc: 'Todd HUDSON'  
 Subject: RE: PLEASE HELP - Five minute review request - Portland Harbor Risk Confusion

Dan -

This sounded a bit urgent, so I will give you my quick review. I think it may help to start with the similarities and then make a clearer distinction between EPA and ATSDR risk assessments. They both identify likely exposure pathways and potentially exposed populations. They both characterize risk.

Differences -

ATSDR provides an assessment of risk independent of EPA.  
 ATSDR can include non-chemical risks, including physical and biological. EPA sticks to chemical risk.  
 ATSDR can balance risks and benefits. EPA does not.  
 The different agencies have different criteria for acceptable risk, which may result in different conclusions.  
 EPA evaluates ecological risks in addition to human health risks.

- Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan Phalen [<mailto:Phalen.Dan@epamail.epa.gov>]  
 Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2011 1:12 PM  
 To: allen.elizabeth@epa.gov; Chip Humphrey; Dan Phalen; Deb Yamamoto; fuentes.rene@epa.gov; Joe Goulet; Lori Cora; Sean Sheldrake; shephard.burt@epa.gov; Kristine Koch; FARRER David.G; Richard Kauffman; ANDERSON Jim M; BISHOP Karen; danab.marcia@deq.state; POULSEN Mike; MCCLINCY Matt  
 Subject: PLEASE HELP - Five minute review request - Portland Harbor Risk Confusion

Importance: High

This email is going out to EPA's internal PH Team, as well as key folks at DEQ, OHA and ATSDR.

The review shouldn't take more than 5 minutes of your time. We need a quick turn around on this in anticipation of ATSDRs approval of the final PHA and pending revisions to a number of fact sheets.

There has been considerable confusion among the public, the media and others about the differences between Public Health Assessments and Risk Assessments. We need a very simple and brief explanation to use, when appropriate, on Portland Harbor fact sheets to help the public understand the differences and to ensure that we all have a consistent message that we have agreed to in advance.

The attached text box has been reviewed and improved by several of you, but it needs a bit further vetting to make sure it is consistent with the perspectives of the various agencies and disciplines involved.

Please review this at your earliest convenience and return any comments you may have to me via email. Once we come to a general consensus on the language internally (within EPA, DEQ, OHA, and ATSDR) I will then ensure that the LWG and CAG adopt the same language and descriptions in their presentation and fact sheets.

(See attached file: DRAFT-Risk\_Assessment\_Comparison\_Text\_Box-V2.docx)

Thanks in advance...

Dan

Dan Phalen - Environmental Education & Community Involvement - US EPA, Region 10 - 206-553-8578

"None are so old as those who have outlived enthusiasm."  
Henry David Thoreau